

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-29 are pending in this application with claims 10 and 23 being amended by this response.

**Rejection of Claims 10-17, 19, and 21-29 under 35 § 102(b)**

Claims 10-17, 19 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Collings.

The present claimed invention recites a method and system for selectively blocking viewing of television programs. A video signal processor produces an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for display to at least one viewer. A supervisor control system is operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile identifying images to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer. The supervisor control system is operable by the supervisor to create at least one override list including select programs having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile. The select programs included in the at least one override list are unblocked.

Collings neither discloses nor suggests creating “at least one override list including select programs having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select programs included in said at least one override list are unblocked” as in the present claimed invention. Collins is directed to selectively blocking audio and video signals based upon a comparison of the contents of data packets transmitted with a television signal to stored preferences. The user may temporarily disable the blocking function for a period of time. Collings requires a direct action by the user to disable the blocking feature. This is unlike the present claimed invention which creates an override list whereby any programs determined to be on the override list automatically disable the blocking feature.

As Collings neither discloses nor suggests creation of an override list allowing for automatically unblocking programs contained in the list as in the present claimed invention, the present claimed invention is not anticipated by Collings. It is thus further respectfully submitted that in view of the above remarks and amendments to claims 10 and 23 to clarify this feature and the above remarks, this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claim 18 and 20 under 35 § 103(a)**

Claim 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collings in view of West.

West was cited to show multiple profiles for different users as well as overrides for each profile. However, similarly to Collings, West neither discloses nor suggests “at least one override list including select programs having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select programs included in said at least one override list are unblocked” as in the present claimed invention. Furthermore, as West neither discloses nor suggests creation of an override list, West could not possibly disclose or suggest use of an override list for numerous profiles as is claimed in claim 18 or creation of multiple override lists as claimed in claim 20.

As neither West nor Collings when taken alone or in combination disclose creation of an override list, it is respectfully submitted that the present claimed invention is not unpatentable over the combination of Collings and West. It is thus further respectfully submitted that in view of the above remarks and amendments to claims 10 and 23 to clarify this feature and the above remarks, this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for

Application No. 09/475,448


Attorney Docket No. RCA89385

allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnston Lynch

By:

  
Jackie Jay Schwartz  
Registration No. 34,721  
Telephone No.: (609) 734-6866

THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operations  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312  
March 2, 2004


Application No. 09/475,448

Attorney Docket No. RCA89385

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. §1.8**

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

Date: 3/2/04

  
Eliza Buchalczyk